REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated February 7, 2008. Claims 23-28 are currently pending.

Claims 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 24 has been amended to correct the informalities to which the Examiner has objected.

The amendment to the specification filed November 21, 2007, was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) for introducing new matter into the disclosure.

Claims 23, 24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,967,746 to Walker et al. (*hereinafter*, "Walker) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0214661 to Kondo (*hereinafter*, "Kondo"). Claims 25 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Kondo, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0149786 to Hudson et al. (*hereinafter*, "Hudson"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

Turning initially to the non-art rejections, the Examiner concluded that "receiving primary device link profile data corresponding to a relationship between an input color space having an input gamut and an output space having an output gamut" was not disclosed in the subject specification. It is respectfully submitted that extremely clear antecedent is found with the subject specification. By way of example, the Examiner's attention is directed to the subject specification, page 5, which teaches mapping of input profiles to output profiles. See, lines 4-5. A mapping is provided between these profiles. See, lines 11-13. Conversion is made between a device independent color space and device dependent color spaces (e.g., a printer). See, page 1, lines 7-9. While the gamut of an input profile is limited only by the boundaries definable by the input color space, (e.g., (0-255, 0-255, 0-255) for 8-bit RGB color space typically associated with monitors, as well as other ranges that may be associated with various inputs), the gamut of the output device cannot print red (255, 0, 0), but instead maps this color to magenta and yellow. The mapping itself depends on the output device. See, page 5, lines 12-15. The mapping between the color spaces is accomplished via ICC profile mapping, typically realized in a lookup

table. See, lookup table 204, Figure 2. As noted in the subject background, earlier attempts have frequently used device profiles to convert between color spaces. See, page 1, lines 7-9. With such clear antecedent, it is respectfully submitted that clear antecedent exists for the subject limitation. Reconsideration of this rejection is urged.

Next, the Examiner concluded that there was no clear antecedent for "the device link profile data including a plurality of vertex values, each vertex value having a value associated with a primary color of the color spaces. By way of example, RGB is a three dimensional color space). The RGB color spaces exist in the ranges defined by maximum values for each component. (255, 0, 0) defines a point in the color space defined as pure red, thus forming the red vertex at this level. Increasing values for green and blue cannot exceed this vertex at the red component since it is at its maximum. It is respectfully submitted that color spaces, defined by their vertices, are so notoriously well known to those of ordinary skill in the art that reiteration of such definition in the specification is superfluous. Notwithstanding, the specification is replete with teaching, such as that noted above, relative to the ranges of color space as defined by their components, such as RGB and CMYK. Reconsideration of this rejection is also urged.

Next, the Examiner concluded a lack of clear antecedent relative to conversion, as discussed above, inclusive of interpolation of values in accordance with displacement from vertex values. Amendment has been made to reflect that conversion is being made relative to vertices between input and output color spaces. As noted above, antecedent for such description is well based. In view of the amendment, it is submitted that this rejection is overcome.

Next, the Examiner concluded there was no clear antecedent relative to comparison data corresponding to a rendered image relative to a plurality of the vertex values. The subject amendment limits the claim to a comparison is relative to device link profile data.

Next, the Examiner concluded there was no clear antecedent for generating modified device link profile data in accordance with received comparison data. However, the subject application teaches making run-time changes to the profile map to improve output. See, page 5, lines 23-25. Accordingly, with the earlier concerns being addressed, it is submitted that this provision is acceptable under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Next, the Examiner found no clear antecedent relative to comparison data in accordance a rendered image and tag data. The specification provides:

> Another aspect of the present invention is to make run-time changes to the printer profile to map the image input primaries to optimal output primaries. The input-output mapping strategy instructions are printer specific and can be included in a printer profile private tag.

Page 5, lines 23-35. This supplements the discussions above, and provides representative antecedent for both modification to printer profile and the tag data. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that clear antecedent is present.

The remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 further address the same areas discussed in detail, above. Analogous amendment and comment is applicable to these additional rejections, corresponding to that above. Accordingly, it is submitted that all rejections under that section are remedied.

In the final, non-art rejection, the examiner found no antecedent for the proposed specification clarification relative to Cyan-Magenta-Yellow (CMK). Insofar as CMY and CMYK are so well understood in the subject application, and throughout the art, for printing, it is presumed the Examiner's concern is in connection with the typographical error, wherein CMK should have been CMY. Appropriate correction has been tendered herewith.

Turning to the art rejections, both Walker and Kondo are directed to color conversions. Walker combines conversion profiles to complete a conversion. Kondo modifies a color conversion definition. The subject application looks backward to an input color profile and selects a conversion from a plurality of options. Further refinement based on actual rendering is further made. Neither Walker nor Kondo teach this aspect. Amendment to independent claim 23 has been made to render more clearly such distinction. The deficiencies in the teachings of Walker and Kondo are not remedied by any additional teachings of Hudson, which is cited for teaching receipt of selection data corresponding to a selected output mode and using such selection data for a preview for use as a comparison for print output. Hudson fails to teach selection of a conversion profile based on a color gamut if an input, along with failing to teach further refinement of such selection based on actual output.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art, and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/24817.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-5-08

Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009